

DAVID S. STEUER, State Bar No. 127059  
 dsteu@wsgr.com  
 MICHAEL B. LEVIN, State Bar No. 172329  
 mlevin@wsgr.com  
 MAURA L. REES, State Bar No. 191698  
 mre@wsgr.com  
 MATTHEW R. REED, State Bar No. 196305  
 mreed@wsgr.com  
 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
 Professional Corporation  
 650 Page Mill Road  
 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050  
 Telephone: (650) 493-9300  
 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100

LUCY YEN, State Bar No. 224559  
 lyen@wsgr.com  
 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
 Professional Corporation  
 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor  
 New York, NY 10019-6022  
 Telephone: (212) 999-5800  
 Facsimile: (212) 999-5899

Attorneys for Defendants  
*InterDigital, Inc.; InterDigital Communications,*  
*Inc.; InterDigital Technology Corporation; IPR*  
*Licensing, Inc.; and InterDigital Patent*  
*Holdings, Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

ASUS COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL; and )  
 ASUSTEK COMPUTER INCORPORATED, )  
 )  
 Plaintiffs, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 INTERDIGITAL, INC.; INTERDIGITAL )  
 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.; INTERDIGITAL )  
 TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION ; IPR )  
 LICENSING, INC. ; and INTERDIGITAL )  
 PATENT HOLDINGS, INC., )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

Case No.: 15-cv-1716 (BLF)

**DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO  
 ASUS'S UNILATERAL  
 STATEMENT RE: DOCUMENT  
 REQUESTS 50, 53, AND 63**

1 ASUS sent a proposed joint statement to InterDigital on this discovery dispute on  
2 Thursday, March 22 – when the deadline for motions to compel is Friday, March 23 – and  
3 demanded a substantive response within one day. Yet the parties were still in the middle of  
4 meeting and conferring about these requests. Just the day before, on Wednesday, March 21,  
5 ASUS had raised these requests in a telephone call with InterDigital, and in that call, had asked  
6 InterDigital to: (1) provide a written position on these requests by March 23; and (ii) agree that  
7 ASUS could file a joint statement on any motion to compel these requests by April 7. Ex. A.  
8 InterDigital promptly agreed in writing to ASUS’s extension proposal the same day. *Id.*

9 Accordingly, InterDigital was very surprised to see ASUS’s draft joint statement on  
10 March 22 demanding that InterDigital provide the other half of the joint statement by March 23,  
11 which was completely inconsistent with the representations ASUS had made the day before with  
12 respect to the extension agreement and ASUS’s intention to later file any joint statements by  
13 April 7. On March 23, as previously agreed, InterDigital provided its written position on these  
14 requests, pursuant to which InterDigital agreed to seek consent from the vendors of industry  
15 analyst report subscriptions to produce the reports, notwithstanding the vendor’s restrictive  
16 license agreements prohibiting such wholesale disclosure of such subscription material. Ex. B.  
17 InterDigital requested that ASUS withdraw the joint statement in light of InterDigital’s  
18 agreement to produce responsive documents upon obtaining consent. *Id.* InterDigital also  
19 expressed its surprise at ASUS’s service of a joint statement on March 22 in light of ASUS’s  
20 request that InterDigital agree to extend the motion to compel deadline for these requests to April  
21 7 and InterDigital’s prior assent thereto. *Id.* InterDigital also informed ASUS that to the extent  
22 ASUS insisted on filing a unilateral statement notwithstanding the parties’ extension agreement  
23 on these requests, which provided ample time for a joint statement (and which, again, was  
24 affirmatively requested and agreed to by ASUS), InterDigital requested that the parties meet and  
25 confer further about these requests on Monday, March 26 pursuant to the Court’s March 23  
26 Order.

27 InterDigital does not believe that the parties have any real dispute with respect to this  
28 request, as it informed ASUS in its March 23 email, and accordingly does not know why ASUS

nevertheless filed a unilateral motion after receiving that email. Particularly in light of the Court's March 23 Order, which directed the parties to meet and confer in an effort to narrow their disputes, there does not seem to be any reason for ASUS to have filed this motion. InterDigital has informed ASUS that, pursuant to the Court's March 23 Order, it will further meet and confer with ASUS on Monday March 26 in an effort to determine why ASUS still considers these requests to be a live dispute (as ASUS has failed to respond to InterDigital's March 23 email asking ASUS to withdraw the draft joint statement). If no resolution is reached, InterDigital will promptly submit a substantive response.

**MEET AND CONFER CERTIFICATION:** As set forth above and in the attached exhibits, InterDigital agreed to seek vendors' consent for production of analyst reports subject to restrictive licenses and informed ASUS of that agreement, but ASUS ignored InterDigital's response and filed its unilateral statement nonetheless.

Dated: March 24, 2018

/s/ Maura L. Rees

David S. Steuer  
Michael B. Levin  
Maura L. Rees  
Matthew R. Reed  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &  
ROSATI  
650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, California 94304-1050  
Telephone: (650) 493-9300  
Facsimile: (650) 493-6811

Lucy Yen  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor  
New York, NY 10019-6022  
Telephone: (212) 999-5800  
Facsimile: (212) 999-5899

*Counsel for Defendants  
InterDigital Communications, Inc., InterDigital  
Technology Corporation, IPR Licensing, Inc., and  
InterDigital Holdings, Inc.*